



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V.—PAUL'S EPISTLES COMPARED WITH ONE ANOTHER AND WITH THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

This paper makes no attempt to settle the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Various claims have been set up by Church Fathers, critics, and scholars for Luke, Paul, Barnabas, Apollos, and others. I shall present none of these claims. By some insistent perversity the name of Paul has been attached to the letter until this good hour, altho modern scholarship overwhelmingly believes that Paul was not its author. Many questions are involved in the study of authorship: the date of composition, the place of composition, the people to whom it was written, the object for which it was written, etc. None of these questions will be discussed at the present time. Following up the suggestion that Paul's writings in some instances resemble the letter to the Hebrews as much as they resemble others of his own letters, it is my pleasure to present a few facts observed and collected from various sources. (I include in this study all the letters generally assigned to Paul.)

As I am in no sense trying to establish or disestablish the Pauline authorship, I pass over the external evidence or lack of evidence with this single statement from Westcott's Introduction to his edition of Hebrews, p. LXVI, in which he claims to give the three opinions current at the first appearance of the letter: "At Alexandria the Greek Epistle was held to be not directly but mediately St. Paul's, as either a free translation of his words or a reproduction of his thoughts. In North Africa it was known to some extent as the work of Barnabas and acknowledged as a secondary authority. At Rome and in western Europe it was not included in the collection of the Epistles of St. Paul and had no Apostolic weight." For a long time the Eastern Church was much more favorably disposed toward the Pauline authorship than the Western Church, tho the West was not without advocates of Pauline authorship. As intimated, that advocacy still persists.

Only a few points of internal evidence will be presented in

this paper, and they are not given to establish Paul's authorship, but rather to prove that in regard to many individual elements of style it was just as possible for Paul to have written Hebrews as it was for him to have written some of the letters assigned to him, if some of his other letters are taken as a standard for those particular constructions.

Before presenting these facts, let me say in general that it is a difficult matter to compare Paul's works as a whole with anything, because each letter is a unit, written at a separate time, to a distinct church or person, for a distinct purpose, on a distinct subject, and therefore there need be no uniformity of practice in any single particular. This fact has been too generally overlooked. One object of this paper is to emphasize it.

VOCABULARY.

In speaking of Hebrews, Westcott says on p. XLIV of his Introduction: "The language of the Epistle is both in vocabulary and style purer and more vigorous than that of any other book of the New Testament." "The vocabulary is singularly copious." But he is forced to add: "In the Pastoral Epistles, however, the proportion is still greater." Upon Thayer's list of "words peculiar to individual New Testament writers" I base my figures. Paul uses words peculiar to himself an average of 6.62 to the page. The average number of words to the page peculiar to Hebrews is 8. When we compare Paul with Paul, we find only four to the page in his larger works, while his Pastoral Epistles show an average of 11 to the page. It is quite clear that the difference between 4 and 11, the low and high averages of Paul, is greater than the difference between 8, the average of Hebrews, and either 4 or 11, and much greater than between 8 and 6.62, the average of all Paul's works; and there are probably greater discrepancies in Paul's individual letters. It is not fair, therefore, to deny the Pauline authorship of Hebrews upon the basis of the large use of words not found elsewhere.

This analysis might be carried further and account taken of the distinction between different classes of peculiar words. In general, it is easily evident without a count that the words most commonly peculiar to Hebrews among the New Testament books

are those which are good Greek words found also in the Septuagint.

On p. XLVI of his Introduction Westcott says: "The absence of some words, e. g., πληροῦν, εὐαγγέλιον, οἰκοδομεῖν, μυστήριον, σύν is remarkable." He is referring to Hebrews. Over against this statement I desire to call attention to Paul's use of each word in the list just given. The Pauline πληροῦν is not found in I Cor., I Thess., I Tim. or Philem. among the works of Paul; it occurs only once each in Gal., II Thess., II Tim., twice in II Cor., and from 4 to 6 times in Rom., Col., Phil., Eph. Certainly I Cor. is no less Paul's than Rom., even tho it lacks πληροῦν. εὐαγγέλιον is a common Pauline word, but here too there is great variety. Titus has no example of it; there is one each in Philem. and I Tim.; there are two each in Col. and II Thess. The short Phil. of 6 pp. has as many occurrences as the much longer Rom. of 26 pp. and more than either of the Cor. of 24 pp. and 17 pp. respectively. Phil. of 6 pp. and Gal. of 9 pp. together have as many as the two Cor., and I Thess. of 6 pp. has as many as I Cor. of 24 pp. οἰκοδομεῖν is used 8 times by Paul, 5 of the occurrences being in I Cor., one each in Rom., Gal., I Thess., none in the rest of his letters including II Cor., which is almost as long as Hebrews. μυστήριον is lacking in half of Paul's letters, II Cor., Gal., Phil., I Thess., II Tim., Titus, Philem. σύν will be discussed under prepositions.

Westcott continues: "The writer (of Hebrews) does not use Paul's rhetorical forms τί οὖν, τί γάρ, ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις, μὴ γένοιτο, ἄρα οὖν, οὐκ οἶδατε. On the other hand, we notice the peculiar phrases ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, εἰς τὸ διηγεῖσθαι, ἔλαθον ξενίσαντες and the particle ὅθεν."

Here again Paul must be compared with himself. His rhetorical τί οὖν occurs most often in Rom., 9 times, 4 times in I Cor., once in Gal., and nowhere else in his letters. The rhetorical τί γάρ is found in Paul only 5 times, twice in I Cor., once each in Rom., II Cor., Phil. Paul uses his rhetorical expression, ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις, just once, I Cor. 15. 35. μὴ γένοιτο occurs 10 times in Rom., once in I Cor., 3 times in Gal., and nowhere else in Paul. ἄρα οὖν is found 8 times in Rom., once each in Gal., Eph., I Thess., II Thess., 12 in all the works of Paul. Paul uses οὐκ οἶδατε only in Rom.,

once, and in I Cor. 10 times. The form *οἶδαμεν* is used by the author of Hebrews just as it is by other writers of the period.

It is readily seen that these rhetorical forms are found in a bare majority of Paul's letters, mostly in Rom., and Gal., and I Cor. Only one of them appears in II Cor., and not one in Col. or the Pastoral Epistles.

Of the expressions mentioned by Westcott as being peculiar to Hebrews, *ὡς ἔπος εἰπείν* occurs once, Heb. 7. 9, the only occurrence in the New Testament; *εἰς τὸ διηγεκές* is found only in Hebrews, once in chap. 7 and 3 times in chap. 10, always in connection with sacrifice or purification, an expression needed and expected in connection with the subject of the letter; *ἐλαθον ξενίσαντες* occurs just once, neither word being found elsewhere in Hebrews, and not at all in Paul; *ᾔθεν* appears 6 times in Hebrews, 4 times in Matt., 3 times in Acts, and once each in Luke and I John.

ᾔθεν 6 times in Hebrews and not at all in Paul's letters sounds plausible to the scholars who claim that Paul could not have written Hebrews. I ask you to recall how freakish Paul can be. As above noted, he uses *οὐκ οἶδατε* 10 times in I Cor. and only once in all his other letters; he uses *μὴ γένοιτο* 10 times in Rom. and 4 times in the rest of his works; he uses *ἄρα οὖν* 8 times in Rom. and 4 times elsewhere, *τί οὖν* 9 times in Rom. and 5 times in other letters. If the author of Hebrews was not Paul, like Paul he occasionally took a fancy to an expression and made free use of it.

PARTICLES.

Many other scholars beside Westcott refer to these expressions in arguing against the Pauline authorship of Hebrews. Dods in his Introduction to the Epistle in the Expositor's Greek Testament quotes from Rendall's Theology of Hebrew Christianity, who makes a "minute comparison of connecting particles, inasmuch as these determine the structure of sentences." He says: "Now in the Epistles of St. Paul *εἴ τις* occurs 50 times, *εἴτε* 63 times, *ποτε* (in affirmative clauses) 19, *εἴτα* (in enumerations) 6, *εἰ δὲ καί* 4, *εἴπερ* 5, *ἐκτὸς εἰ μή* 3, *εἴγε* 4, *μήπως* 12, *μηκέτι* 10, *μενοῦνγε* 3, *ἐάν* 83, while none of these are found in the Epistle of Hebrews except *ἐάν*, and that only once (or twice) except in quotations. On the other hand, *ᾔθεν* which

occurs 6 times and *ἐάνπερ* which occurs 3 times in the Epistle are never used by St. Paul."

An analysis of these facts and figures shows that of the 50 occurrences of *εἴτις* in Paul, 18 are found in I Cor. of 24 pp., only 3 in Rom. of 26 pp., and none in Col. of 6 pp., I Thess. of 6 pp., II Tim. of 5 pp.

Likewise most of the 63 or 64 uses of *εἴτε* are found in the two Cor., 41 in all, 27 of them in I Cor. Several of the letters have only one or two and there are none at all in Gal. of 9 pp. or in any of the Pastoral Epistles of 16 pp.

Paul's use of *ποτε* is interesting. He uses it 4 times in Gal. of 9 pp., 6 times in Eph. of 9 pp., and only 3 times in Rom. of 26 pp., once in I Cor. of 24 pp., and not at all in II Cor. of 17 pp. Neither is it found in I Thess. nor in either letter to Timothy. Furthermore, *ποτε* does occur twice in the first chapter of Hebrews, both times, to be sure, in an interrogative sentence, but in neither case as an interrogative particle.

The six occurrences of *εἴτα* in enumerations in Paul are all in I Cor. and I Tim. There is one *εἴτα* in Hebrews, 12. 9, not in an enumeration of figures, but in an enumeration of arguments, with the meaning of 'further,' 'yet again.'

Ten of Paul's letters lack the combination *εἰ δὲ καί*, 9 do not have *εἴπερ*, and 11 are without *ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ*. The 4 occurrences of *εἴγε* are limited to 3 of his letters, and the 10 occurrences of *μήπως* are confined to 4 letters, 5 of them being in II Cor. *μηκέτι* is lacking in 8 letters, and *μενοῦνγε* is found only in Rom. and Phil.

The statement of Rendall quoted by Dods shows that Paul is very fond of *ἐάν*: he has used it 83 times, yet 4 of his letters do not use it at all, Phil. 6 pp., II Thess. 3 pp., Titus 3 pp., Philem. 1 p. Of his 83 examples, 40 are in I Cor., 17 in Rom., 7 in II Cor., 6 in Gal., 1 in Eph. Gal. and Eph. have 9 pp. each, and Rom. has 2 pp. more than I Cor. *ὅθεν* has already been discussed.

ἐάνπερ is used twice in Hebrews and nowhere else in the New Testament, just as *μενοῦνγε* mentioned above is found 3 times in Paul and nowhere else in the N. T.

Continuing the study of particles, Mr. L. W. Harvison of our graduate class has found that of 28 possible words of this class, Paul has used 26, all but *ὅθεν* and *καίτοι*, the author of Hebrews has used 22, omitting *ἄρα οὖν*, *διόπερ*, *μέντοι*, *μενοῦνγε*, *γε*, *ἄρα*. The average number of these particles to the p. is for

Hebrews 10.24, for Paul 12.79. Paul's percentages for his different letters range from 16.71 in I Cor. to 3.33 in Col. The usage of Hebrews is the same as Paul's in Phil., II Tim., and Philem., and practically the same as in I Tim. and I Thess. The average of Hebrews is higher than Paul's in II Thess., Eph., Titus, Col., and lower than the average in Rom., I and II Cor., and Gal., the most Pauline letters. In number of different particles Hebrews leads with 22, Rom. has 20, I Cor. 19, II Cor. 16. Of the particles used by Hebrews and not by Paul, *ὅθεν* has been discussed and *καίτοι* occurs but once, in fact, only twice in all the New Testament. Of the particles used by Paul and not by Hebrews, *ἄρα οὖν* and *μενοῦνγε* have been disposed of; *δόπερ* occurs twice in I Cor. and nowhere else in Paul or the N. T.; *μέντοι* is cited once for all Paul; *γε* including all its combinations is found 14 times in Paul, 5 of them being in Rom., none at all appearing in I and II Thess. or in the Pastoral Epistles; the interrogative *ἄρα* occurs once in Paul.

Now comparing the more common particles, we find in every case that Paul's average practice is nearer the practice of Hebrews than that of some of his own letters. Hebrews leads in the percentage occurrences of *γάρ* 3.40 to 3.09, also in the combination *καὶ γάρ* .24 to .15, and they are exactly parallel in the use of *εἰ γάρ*, .2 each. Of course Paul varies in the use of his combinations: 12 of his 19 *καὶ γάρ*'s occur in I and II Cor., and 11 of his 24 *εἰ γάρ*'s are found in Rom. Several of his letters are without one or the other and 4 are without both.

In the use of *δέ* Paul leads, 4.43 to 1.9. Hebrews, on the other hand, has a larger percentage of *μέν*—*δέ*, .66 to .33, which might indicate better balance and finish on the part of Hebrews. Upon examination, however, we find that Paul's usage in I Cor., Phil., and II Tim. exactly parallels the usage in Hebrews, tho in 6 of his letters Paul does not use the combination at all.

Paul has a slightly higher average in the use of *οὖν*, .79 to .50. In the combination *μὲν οὖν* Heb. leads .14 to .05, but there again the average in Heb. just corresponds to the average of Paul in I Cor. and is below Paul's average in Phil., .14 to .33.

The adversative particle *ἀλλά*, likewise, is found more often in Paul than in Heb., 2.29 to .76, or a difference in favor of Paul of 3 to 1. Yet even here, at least one of Paul's letters, Col., falls below Heb. with a per-

centage of .5. Even in the use of the balancing antithetic group, οὐ μόνον—ἀλλὰ καί, Paul has a higher average than Heb., .23 to .05. However, in at least five of his letters, including I Cor., he does not use the combination at all. His inconsistency is shown from the fact that in Rom. of 26 pp. he uses this combination 11 times and not once in I Cor. of 24 pp. δ.6

shows an average occurrence of .43 in Heb. and .22 in Paul, yet in II Cor., Eph., and Philem. Paul's averages are respectively .51, .55, and 1., greater in each case than that of Heb., while on the other hand, the particle is omitted from 5 of Paul's letters.

τε is found relatively more in Heb. than in Paul, but not a great deal in either. It is used freely in the N. T. only in Acts. The averages for τε solitarium are Paul .04, Heb. .14; for τε—τε Paul .03, Heb. .095; for τε—καί Paul .12, Heb. .62. Eight of Paul's letters do not use τε at all, yet Rom. averages up well with Heb., τε .08 to .14, τε—τε .11 to .095, τε—καί .42 to .62. The author of Rom. is very much more like the author of Heb. than he is like Paul in the other letters ascribed to him as far as τε is concerned.

All N. T. writers make scant use of δῆ. Paul and Hebrews have it once each.

Any claims set up for the artistic superiority of Hebrews as compared with Paul are not well founded as far as particles are concerned, unless one picks out individual letters of Paul for each particle. The artistic skill should appear especially in the combinations of particles, but in every case Paul is equal to Hebrews in one or more of his letters, and in every case more consistent with Hebrews than epistle by epistle with himself.

PREPOSITIONS.

Of the 32 prepositions and prepositional adverbs used in the N. T., Paul has 10 not found in Hebrews and Hebrews has 2 not found in Paul. Most of those not found in both are prepositional adverbs and occur from 1 to 4 times. The one exception is σύν which Paul uses 38 times and Hebrews not at all. σύν is not common in the N. T., only Luke and Paul using it with any frequency. See Blass's Grammar, Thackeray's translation, p. 132, and Clark, Prepositions in N. T. Greek, p. 46. In keeping with the nature of this investigation, where do these 38 σύν's

of Paul appear? They are distributed among 8 letters, not one being found in II Thess. or in the Pastoral Epistles. Gal. of 9 pp. and Phil. of 6 pp. have as many examples each as Rom. of 26 pp., while Col. of 6 pp. has more than Rom. of 26 pp. and as many as I Cor. of 24 pp. and II Cor. of 17 pp.

The other prepositions which have the greatest number of occurrences correspond very well in their averages in Paul and Hebrews, except the preposition *ἐν*. I write the percentage of Paul first each time: *ἀπό* .82: 1.09; *διά* 2.2: 2.7; *εἰς* 3.28: 3.52; *ἐκ*(*ξ*) 1.61: 1.; *ἐπί* .99: 1.4; *κατά* 1.43: 1.9; *μετά* .515: 1.09; *παρά* .29: .48; *περί* .375: 1.09; *πρός* 1.11: .86; *ὑπέρ* .765: .48; *ὑπό* .58: .43. Not only are these averages close, but the detailed averages for these prepositions with the several cases are equally close: *διά* with gen. 1.39: 1.81, w. acc. .64: .81; *ἐπί* w. gen. .19: .34, w. dat. .38: .48, w. acc. .38: .57; *κατά* w. gen. .11: .10, w. acc. 1.24: 1.62; *μετά* w. gen. .50: .67, w. acc. .03: .43; *παρά* w. gen. .09: 0, w. dat. .11: 0, w. acc. .11: .48; *περί* w. gen. .39: .95, w. acc. .055: 0; *ὑπέρ* w. gen. .65: .43, w. acc. .086: .048; *ὑπό* w. gen. .33: .43, w. acc. .17: 0. It does not seem necessary to analyze these figures for Paul's individual letters as has been done above. Suffice it to say that the same general conditions previously stated exist.

Of course, it is well known, as Moulton has pointed out, Grammar of N. T. Greek, Vol. I³, p. 61, that "Greek is . . . marked . . . by the very free use of prepositions. This characteristic is most obviously intensified in Hellenistic, where we are perpetually finding prepositional phrases used to express relations which in classical Greek would have been adequately given by a case alone." In N. T. Greek we find *εἰς* making wonderful inroads into the territory of *ἐν*, and *ἐν* is making still greater inroads into the territory of *εἰς* and taking up other uses to which it was not the rightful heir. This intermixture is quite marked in narrative writers of the N. T., except Matt. and to some extent in John. "The epistles," says Blass, l. c., p. 123 (39. 3), "show at least in the local signification a correct discrimination between *εἰς* and *ἐν*." Blass does not distinguish here between the epistles of Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews. The occurrences of *εἰς* in Paul and Hebrews are on an equality as to number, 3.28 to 3.52, giving Hebrews a slight majority relatively. On the other hand, Paul used *ἐν* much more freely,

7.36 to 3.05. Here then, where Paul used more than twice as many *ἐν*'s to the page as Hebrews, how does he compare with himself? His Gal. and Eph. have the same number of chapters and the same number of pp., yet the former has 41 occurrences of *ἐν*, the latter 119; Phil. and Col. likewise correspond as to the quantity of Greek, but the former has 63 *ἐν*'s, the latter 89; both Phil. and Col. are distinctly shorter than Gal., but they have each more occurrences of *ἐν*: Phil. 63, Col. 89, Gal. 41. Every letter of Paul's has a higher percentage of *ἐν*'s than Hebrews, but there is quite a range between Gal. and Titus on the one hand with a percentage of 4.55 and Eph. with 13.22 and Col. with 14.83 on the other hand.

One of Paul's pet phrases, *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, which he uses 48 times, helps to swell the number of *ἐν*'s, and it may be urged that this phrase marks another ground of distinction between Paul and Heb. Passing over the fact of difference in subject-matter, or content, we find that Paul is not consistent with himself. The expression is not found in II Cor. of 17 pp., nor in II Thess., nor in Titus, and there is marked variation in his other letters, some of the shorter ones using the expression more often than the longer ones.

In regard to the uses of the dat. with *ἐν* in other than simple local meanings, Paul has 12 such instances in Rom. of 26 pp., and Heb. of 21 pp. has 11. Thus Paul in Rom. is nearer Heb. in this respect than he is to any of his other letters.

It would seem, then, as far as prepositions are concerned, even including *σύν* and *ἐν*, that Paul, the writer of some epistles, could have written Hebrews just as well as he could have written other epistles assigned to him. In the use of every preposition Paul differs with himself as much as he differs with Hebrews.

THE ARTICLE WITH PROPER NAMES.

In his Master's thesis on The Article with Proper Names in N. T. Greek, Mr. E. W. McLaurin says: "Paul and the author of Hebrews use the anarthrous construction exclusively with indeclinable place-names." In the same authors "declinable place-names also omit the article more frequently than they have it, except in I. Thess., where the articular construction prevails in the proportion of 5 to 2." For Hebrews "The ratio of the

anarthrous to the articular in declinable place-names is 3 to 2." "Paul uses 10 anarthrous declinable place-names and no declinable place-names with the article in II Tim., whereas the ratio in I Thess. is 2 to 5, . . . with books all the varying distances between. . . . Hebrews would have about the same ratio as II Cor. or Gal.," and that is about Paul's average.

"With indeclinable personal names in Paul's epistles, sometimes the articular and sometimes the anarthrous construction occurs more frequently. Hebrews prefers the anarthrous construction 33 to 4." Hebrews has a greater proportion of anarthrous occurrences than Rom., I Cor., Gal. and Eph., but a smaller proportion than II Cor., Phil., and II Tim. "With declinable personal names, Paul more often uses the anarthrous construction, usually showing a decided preference for that construction. But Eph. is an equally strong exception where the articular construction prevails 22 to 7. Hebrews shows a preference of 22 to 8 for the anarthrous construction."

The results regarding double names are relatively the same.

ARTICULAR INFINITIVE.

I shall let Mr. Sam L. Joekel, The Articular Infinitive in N. T. Greek (Un. Tex. Master's Thesis), state his own conclusions on the question of the articular infinitive: "A comparison between the figures of Paul's epistles and those for Hebrews shows some interesting coincidences. The general averages for Paul and Hebrews are two of the highest in the N. T., Hebrews leading with an average of 1.09. Paul's average is .89." "The averages in Phil. and the two Thess. far exceed that of the other epistles of Paul, as they do that of Hebrews. On the other hand, nearly all the rest of Paul's epistles fall far below the average of Hebrews, and the Pastorals and Col. show no examples whatever." "With regard to individual constructions, the nom. and the acc., both with and without the preposition, lead in both Paul and Hebrews."

These conclusions are borne out by the following summary of figures worked out by Mr. Joekel:

	Gen.	Acc. & prep.	Dat. & prep.	Nom. & acc.	Dat.	Average
Rom.	9	16	2	5	0	1.24
I Cor.	2	7	1	5	0	.62
II Cor.	3	4	0	9	1	.94
Gal.	3	1	1	0	0	.62
Eph.	0	3	0	0	0	.33
Phil.	3	2	0	11	0	2.66
I Thess.	0	7	0	4	0	2.10
II Thess.	0	6	0	0	0	2.00
Col. & Pastorals	} 0	0	0	0	0	
Heb.						
	5	9	4	3	0	1.09

CONDITIONS.

An examination of conditional sentences as worked out by Mr. John Barrow, of the Seminar in Greek N. T., yields similar results. Paul uses simple conditions more freely than the author of Hebrews, 1.18 to the page as against .38 for Heb., but he is wholly inconsistent in his several letters; 83 of his 151 examples are in Rom. and I Cor., which constitute considerably less than half of his corpus, while Eph. of 9 pp. has no simple condition, and Gal., which is of the same length, uses this form 15 times. $\epsilon\iota$ with the pres. ind. is the most generally used form of this condition in both Paul and Heb. Paul, however, uses $\epsilon\iota$ with pres. ind. 27 times in I Cor. of 24 pp. and only 12 times in Rom. of 26 pp. Heb. has as much variety in simple conditions as any of Paul's letters except Rom. and has about the same average as all the letters other than Rom., I and II Cor., and Gal.

The general proportion of apodosis for the simple condition is about the same as for the protasis, 1.13 to .38, the distribution and variety being about the same. Likewise the forms of apodosis that prevail in Paul, the pres. ind., fut. ind., and verb omitted, prevail also in Heb. The imperative, which Paul uses fairly frequently, does not occur in Heb. It is also lacking in 5 of Paul's letters, and is used only once in Rom. of 26 pp. and II Cor. of 17 pp., while I Cor. of 24 pp. has it 14 times and I Tim. of 7 pp. has it 5 times.

Paul uses the pres. gen. conditions a little more freely than Heb., .44 to .24, but here again most of the examples, 47 of the 61, are in Rom. and I Cor. II Cor. has one more than Heb.; Gal., I Thess., I Tim. have only one each, while Eph., Phil.,

II Thess., Titus, and Philem. have none. Of the 5 uses by Heb. 4 are not found in Paul, but the 8 different forms used in 1 each of Paul's letters are not found elsewhere in him or in Heb. The same conditions prevail in the apodosis. The situation is reversed in the unreal conditions, Heb. having a larger proportion, .24 to .07. Paul uses this condition in only 3 of his letters. Rom., the longest of his letters, has 1 occurrence; Gal., about one-third as long, has 3; and I Cor. of 24 pp. has just as many as Heb. of 21 pp. The prevailing form in both Paul and Heb. is $\epsilon\iota$ with the impf. The apodosis follows the same lines.

In the future more vivid condition Paul again has a larger proportion, .33 to .14. Of his 43 occurrences 29 are in Rom. and I Cor. This condition is entirely lacking in Phil., Titus, and Philem. There is one in Eph., a doubtful one in I Thess., and 2 in II Cor. of 17 pp. as compared with 3 in Heb. of 21 pp. Heb. has one form, $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\rho$ with pres. sub., which is not used by Paul, and Paul has at least 5 forms in as many letters that are not used elsewhere by him or by Heb. The apodosis needs no additional comment.

In general, it is perfectly fair to say that Paul makes larger use of conditions than the writer of Heb., except in the case of the unreal condition, but it is also fair to remark that his higher average is caused by a few of his letters, whereas the majority of them are nearer the average of Heb., and in every case there are letters of Paul that correspond better with Heb. than with Paul.

HIATUS.

Reference must be made to one of Blass's strongest points. In his grammar, p. 296 of Thackeray's translation, he says: "The Epistle to the Hebrews is the only piece of writing in the N. T., which in structure of sentence and style shows the care and dexterity of an artistic writer, and so it cannot be wondered at, if it is in this work alone that the principle of avoiding hiatus, is, to some extent, taken into account." Among other cases in which Blass claims that hiatus is studiously avoided $\mu\acute{\eta}$, $\delta\iota\acute{o}$, and the possible forms of the article and the relative are mentioned.¹

¹ These are sufficient for illustration. I count all Hebrews, including quotations and chapter 13, both of which Blass has omitted.

Paul uses $\mu\eta$ more frequently than Hebrews, 2.19 to the page to 1.33. Paul's use runs as high as 4 to the page in Titus, more than 3 to the p. in II Thess., and nearly 3 to the p. in I Tim. and I Cor. His low average, about one-half that of Hebrews, is .66 in Phil. and .6 in II Tim., and 0 in the one p. of Philem. Now note the relative percentages in Paul and Hebrews between the total number of $\mu\eta$'s and $\mu\eta$ with hiatus. Of Paul's 267 occurrences 113 show hiatus; of Hebrews' 28, 9 show hiatus, a relative percentage of .42 to .32, a difference of .1. Paul's highest percentage of $\mu\eta$'s showing hiatus as compared with the total is .66 found in II Tim. Five of his letters have .5 or .5 plus, four have .4 or .4 plus, while II Cor. has .32—exactly the percentage of Hebrews—and Gal. has only .25, these last two being among the most Pauline of Paul's works. The page proportions also are interesting. Paul's percentage of $\mu\eta$'s showing hiatus is .92 to the p., Hebrews .43. Comparing Paul's works, his highest percentage is 1.66 in II Thess. and Titus. Gal. has practically the same as Hebrews, .44 to .43, II Tim. is just below with .4, and Phil. goes down to .33. From the foregoing it appears that Paul uses $\mu\eta$ more frequently than Hebrews in the proportion of 2.19 per page to 1.33; his percentage of all $\mu\eta$'s to $\mu\eta$ with hiatus is .42 to .32 in Hebrews; his page percentage of hiatus $\mu\eta$ is better than that of Hebrews, .92 to .43: but in every case he is more at variance with himself than he is with Hebrews both in his extremes and in his general averages. Can we, therefore, justly claim more artistic work on the part of the author of Hebrews in the avoidance of hiatus with $\mu\eta$ than for Paul in some of his works, notably Gal., II Tim., and Phil.?

In the case of $\delta\omega$, Paul's numbers are proportionally lower, .14 to .43. In the proportion between the totals of $\delta\omega$ and those showing hiatus, Paul and Heb. are practically parallel, .4 to .33, but Paul's average to the page is less than that of Heb., .09 to .14. In 5 of Paul's letters $\delta\omega$ does not occur. In two it occurs once each and in one twice: in none of these four is there hiatus. In some of the remaining letters the page percentage of hiatus avoidance is below that of Heb.: Gal., .11 to .14, Rom. .077 to .14, I Cor. .04 to .14. The proportion of hiatus occurrences to the total occurrences is slightly higher in Gal. and in I Cor. and II Cor. In Eph. it is .4 to Heb. .33, in Rom. it is just .33.

The forms of the article and of the relative taken into account in hiatus are: δ , η , $\tau\acute{o}$, $\tau\omicron\upsilon$, $\tau\hat{\phi}$, $\tau\eta$, $\omicron\iota$, $\alpha\iota$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}$, δ , η , $\omicron\iota$, $\alpha\iota$, α , $\omicron\upsilon$, ϕ , η . Blass has found 52 cases of hiatus with these forms in those portions of Heb. which he has counted, just 4 to the page. The average to the page for Paul, exclusive of Rom. and I Cor., which I have not counted, is 5.97. Paul's highest average is in the little one-page Philem., which has 11 cases of hiatus; the next highest is Col., 8.33, then II Thess. 8, and so on down to Titus, 4.33, just above the average of Heb., and finally I Tim. with only 2.59. Here Paul is nearly as far below Heb. as Heb. is below Paul's average, 3 to the page below his own average, and more than 8 to the page below his maximum in Philem. Whatever the cause, Paul has avoided hiatus with forms of the article and relative more than Hebrews in at least one of his letters, I Tim. It is not impossible to believe that he might have been equally successful in Hebrews.²

I cannot contend that either the author of Hebrews or Paul studiously avoided hiatus, tho one gets that feeling for both at times when looking for examples of its occurrence. There are many considerations that enter in as determining factors, *e. g.*, the use or omission of the article, the use of prepositional phrases, such as $\epsilon\nu$ with the dative, or $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ with the accusative, between the article and the noun, and strikingly the occurrence of certain words beginning with vowels which are demanded by the subject-matter of the letter. One illustration of this point will suffice. Recall from the early part of this paper that $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$ does not occur in Hebrews. It occurs as many as 9 times in some of Paul's letters. He does not use it in Titus and only once in I Tim., the two works nearest Hebrews in the use of hiatus.

I have the temerity to present these facts and figures and express these views in the face of Westcott's statement, Introduction, p. LXXVIII, that "the Epistle cannot be the work of St. Paul"; of the statement of Dods in the Expositor's text, Vol. 4, p. 224, "the bare reading of the Epistle suffices to convince us that the Pauline authorship may be set aside as incredible"; of the equally positive statement of Peake in his Introduction, p. 28, "nothing is so certain with respect to the

² Blass has made other counts for hiatus which may be passed over for the present.

authorship as a negative conclusion that it was not written by Paul"; and of many other similar statements by excellent scholars. After Dods has given an excellent résumé of the differences between Paul and Hebrews, he says, in a footnote, quoting from Rendall's *Theology*: "Diversity of style is more easily felt by the reader than expressed by the critic, without at least a tedious analysis of language; one simple and tangible test presents itself, however, in the use of connecting particles, inasmuch as these determine the structure of sentences." He then gives that array of particles which I gave earlier in the paper and which I tried to dispose of by the double comparison of Paul with Hebrews and Paul with Paul.

There are a great many other problems requiring investigation—some of which have been mentioned—before we can claim with positiveness that it was not impossible for Paul to have written Hebrews. When that conclusion has been reached, it will be time to begin a constructive attempt to sift the evidence and establish the fact of the Pauline authorship of Hebrews.

DANIEL A. PENICK.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.